DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 709 HE 026 459

AUTHOR Ward, Kelly A.; And Others
TITLE Multiculturalism and Innovation in Academe: Recent Approaches.
INSTITUTION National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, University Park, PA.; Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 92
CONTRACT R117G10037
NOTE 59p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; College Administration; Core Curriculum; Cultural Context; Cultural Differences; *Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Ethnic Groups; *Higher Education; Minority Groups; *Participative Decision Making
IDENTIFIERS *Diversity Concept

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how institutions of higher education can achieve more diverse academic communities. It is argued that modernist interpretations of organizations limit academic change designed to encourage the voiceless members of society through an overemphasis on outcomes and efficiency. Section 1 discusses the general debate between conservative educators and multiculturalists, i.e., whether a core curriculum should be rooted in a limited set of Western ideals designed to promote a unifying cultural experience, or whether culturally diverse experiences should be created, not only through curricular diversity, but through increased participation of underrepresented groups among both students and staff. Section 2 discusses organizational theory, delineating five modernist conceptions of organizations: the bureaucratic perspective; the human relations perspective; the political perspective; the cybernetic perspective; and the cultural perspective. Section 3 examines modern and postmodern conceptions of organizations, their theoretical origins, assumptions, conceptions of the process of change, and the role that leaders play in the process of change. The final section provides a practical examination of academic innovation and change, focusing on efforts to create a multicultural academy. Contains 100 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357709

MULTICULTURALISM AND INNOVATION IN ACADEME: RECENT APPROACHES

Kelly A. Ward

Linda A. La Salle

Robert A. Rhoads

Center for the Study of Higher Education

The Pennsylvania State University

HE 026 459

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Project No.: R117G10037
CFDA No.: 84.117G

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

One of the most challenging tasks that lies ahead for American higher education is dealing with an increasingly diverse society. By diversity we refer to characteristics related to gender, class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. In light of this growing diversity many educators have called for a wider range of cultural experiences for inclusion in the curriculum in particular and in the organization of communities of higher education in general. We typically describe these educators as multiculturalists since they argue for institutions to encourage a multitude of cultural expressions. From a multicultural perspective, the problem that institutions of higher learning face is promoting increased diversity while at the same time establishing or maintaining a sense of community. The goal, therefore, is the implementation of academic change that promotes academic communities composed of a multitude of cultural differences.

The purpose of this paper is to examine how institutions can achieve academic change that enables a variety of voices -- some familiar and some new -- to be heard. Our review of the literature leads us to believe that a key to understanding the process of integrating silenced voices is tied to the way that organizations are conceived. More specifically, we argue that modernist interpretations of organizations limit academic change designed to encourage the voiceless members of society through an overemphasis on outcomes and efficiency. In other words, when

organizations are seen as instruments engaged in the pursuit of utilitarian ends there is a bias toward the status quo, which renders alternate realities or voices invisible. We use the word modernist to refer to those organizational frames emphasizing a rational or functionalist view of the world. In contrast, we stress how an emergent organizational perspective -- what we define as a postmodernist interpretation of organizations -- can be helpful in developing more diverse academic communities.

In section one we discuss the general debate between conservative educators and multiculturalists. Conservative educators advocate for a core curriculum rooted in a limited set of Western ideals designed to promote a unifying cultural experience. Multiculturalists stress the legitimation of a multitude of cultural experiences, not only through curricular diversity, but also through increased participation of underrepresented groups among both students and staff. The debate between conservatives and multiculturalists is relevant in that it highlights the need for academic innovation and change, while at the same time, the debate reveals the differing perceptions of the problems faced by academicians.

In section two we discuss organizational theory, delineating five modernist conceptions of organizations: the bureaucratic perspective, the human relations perspective, the political perspective, the cybernetic perspective, and the cultural perspective.

Postmodern conceptions of organizations form the focus of

section three in which we stress the subjectivity of human experience and reject the modernist emphasis on functionalism and rationality. In discussing modern and postmodern conceptions of organizations we present their theoretical origins, assumptions, conceptions of the process of change, and the role that leaders play in the process of change. Finally, in section four we move from a theoretical discussion of organizations and organizational change to a more practical examination of academic innovation and change, focusing on efforts to create a multicultural academy.

I. Conservatives and Multiculturalists

In this section we compare two divergent perspectives on higher education -- a conservative view and a multicultural perspective. This debate is important because discussions between both conservatives and multiculturalists revive the politics of curricular and organizational change within academe. We examine how these groups conceive of curricular matters as well as the organization and structure of academe.

Background and Underlying Assumptions

In Bennett's (1984) report on the state of the humanities in higher education he argued, "Although more than 50 percent of America's high school graduates continue their education at American colleges and universities, few of them can be said to receive there an adequate education in the culture and civilization of which they are members" (p. 1). Bloom (1987)

offered a similar criticism when he stated, "The only serious solution is the one that is almost universally rejected: the good old Great Books approach, in which a liberal education means reading certain generally recognized classic texts, just reading them, letting them dictate what the questions are and the method of approaching them" (p. 344). Similarly, Hirsch (1987) claimed that the American educational system fails to adequately achieve a common level of cultural understanding as evidenced by vocabulary weaknesses in our current graduates. While conservatives argue that the curriculum should emphasize a core of common knowledge designed to promote a unifying educational experience, multiculturalists stress the variety of cultural expressions evident on the American scene and the need for curricular changes that reflect different cultural experiences and understandings. Multiculturalists desire a diversity of course offerings. They encourage the development of courses that not only discuss Native American cultures, African cultures, Women's studies, and Lesbian and Gay studies, but also promote courses that acknowledge the contributions of these groups. In other words, multiculturalists seek increased participation and diverse contributions to an expanding world view, as opposed to simply giving lip service to diversity through efforts aimed at increasing the numbers of non-traditional groups.

Multiculturalists stress that a more diversified academy helps to legitimate the lives and experiences of people from a multitude of cultures and at the same time increases the range of

learning experiences on behalf of all participants. By promoting diversity within academe, colleges and universities can contribute to an important social problem -- the oppression and subjugation of underrepresented peoples. Conservatives, however, frequently argue that the curriculum as well as academe in general should not be a site of social contestation. As an example, D'Souza (1991) stated, "The liberal university is a distinctive and fragile institution. It is not an all-purpose instrument for social change" (p. 257). He went on to add:

> Liberal education is too important to entrust to these self-styled revolutionaries. Reform, if it comes, requires the involvement of intelligent voices from both inside and outside the university -- students who are willing to take on reigning orthodoxies, professors and administrators with the courage to resist the activist high tide, and parents, alumni, and civic leaders who are committed to applying genuine principles of liberal learning to the challenge of the emerging multicultural society" (p. 257).

Consistent throughout the preceding conservative comment is the notion of liberal learning and liberal education based on a common core of knowledge, also referred to as classical education. Conservatives argue that the contemporary American educational experience has moved away from the classical education which has traditionally stressed the great works of Western civilizations such as the writings of Plato, Homer, Sophocles, Dante, Shakespeare, Descartes, and Goethe. The conservative view of education is one in which students learn a common core of knowledge -- the knowledge that has guided great Western societies. The underlying assumption is that knowledge from Western civilizations is superior to knowledge from other

parts of the world.

While multiculturalists, for the most part, do not dispute that Western societies have made tremendous advances in many areas, they point out that this is a partial view and that other societies have also made significant contributions. Hill (1991) succinctly elaborated:

> I do not expect Native Americans to leap-frog in the near future over the Japanese and Americans in the production of smart bombs or compact discs. But by and large I will expect, until proven otherwise in sustained conversations of respect, that marginalized cultures of the world have much to contribute to medicine, to agricultural science, to our understanding of the relationship of humanity and the environment, to child-rearing, to therapy, and to dozens of other important things. The advanced industrial nations of the world have cornered the market on neither wisdom nor science. (p. 46)

Multiculturalists seek not to replace the study of Western civilization but rather to demythologize it as well as complement understanding through a greater awareness of other human experiences and cultures. Once again, Hill (1991) is helpful:

> I am not suggesting that we not study Western civilization, nor that it be marginalized or caricatured as the sole root of the world's many problems. I am suggesting , rather: a) that both its origins and in its current form it be studied in interaction with other cultures and with its own subcultures; and that this study take the form of a dialogue with members of those other (sub)cultures in situations of "equal placement and security. (p. 46)

Education or Indoctrination?

Multicultural educators often argue that current educational structures indoctrinate students to societal prescriptions that are culturally alienating for students from underrepresented

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

groups. By societal prescriptions we refer to structures within society that favor certain roles, behaviors and attitudes that conform to dominant or mainstream expectations. Marginalized members of our society either do poorly in school or succeed through assimilation into a system favoring middle and upper class values. Rossides (1984) noted, "Liberal arts education is largely a socializing experience; those who succeed do so because they have acquired a middle class personality" (p. 17). The argument follows that an educational system that serves as an instrument of assimilation and indoctrination alienates students from less privileged cultural backgrounds; in effect, their lives and experiences are not legitimated by the educational system.

Not only does the content of the curriculum serve as a legitimating or non-legitimating force, but teaching style can also have harmful impacts. Freire (1970) attributed a large part of the alienating experience of marginalized people to the dominance of the "banking" concept of educational instruction. Freire described the characteristics of the banking style of teaching:

> The teacher teaches and the students are taught; the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing; the teacher thinks and the students are thought about; the teacher talks and the students listen -- meekly; the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined; the teacher chooses and enforces his [sic] choice, and the students comply; ... the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his [sic] own professional authority, which he [sic] sets in opposition to the freedom of the students... (p. 59)

Most of the discussion thus far in this section has in one way or another alluded to the political nature of education and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

knowledge itself. While conservatives tend to either deny or fail to see the politics of knowledge, many multicultural educators argue that knowledge is a social construction open for debate and frequently dictated by dominant societal groups (Giroux, 1983, 1986). They see the curriculum, therefore, as a political forum where various groups attempt to assert their views over others. Conservatives frequently attack multiculturalists for infusing politics into higher education, yet multiculturalists argue that curricular issues and educational matters have always been political. Writing over half a century ago, Dewey (1938) commented, "All social movements involve conflicts which are reflected intellectually in controversies." He also added, "It would not be a sign of health if such an important social interest as education were not also an arena of struggles, practical and theoretical" (p. 5).

Multiculturalists argue that conservative philosophies tend to dominate our educational systems -- philosophies that reflect the maintenance of current societal structures. Frequently such philosophies remain buried in the taken-for-granted assumptions of the classroom. The "hidden curriculum" depicts the unspoken functions of schooling that multiculturalists attempt to bring into question through a critical examination of educational structures, rituals, and practices. A number of educational critics argue that the hidden curriculum or hidden agenda of schooling is actually intended to maintain current societal attitudes and beliefs about capital (Althusser, 1970; Bowles &

Gintis, 1976). Yet others see the hidden curriculum encompassing an even broader agenda -- dominant cultural structures and beliefs (Bernstein, 1977; Bourdieu, 1977). The null curriculum--that which is excluded from the learning process (Eisner, 1979)--and the hidden curriculum serve to limit the critical capability of students, resulting in the reproduction of students whose goals are compatible with current economic and/or cultural expectations.

Reproduction views of education are helpful in understanding the nature of oppressive educational structures; however, they fail to fully account for the actual experience of students -- namely resistance. Willis (1977), McLaren (1980), and Eckert (1989) highlighted the oppositional behavior toward schooling exhibited by working class children. Giroux (1983) discussed the indignation that students feel when their experiences and indeed their very lives are separated from the school experience. In other words, resistance occurs when students' experiences are separated from the learning process. Several decades earlier, Dewey (1938) noted this fundamental notion of schooling when he wrote, "There is an intimate and necessary relation between the processes of actual experience and education" (p. 20).

Multicultural educators seek to bring a variety of "actual experience[s]" and cultural expressions into our educational settings. They examine curricular matters as well as organizational structures in search of practices that alienate students, faculty, and staff who have been marginalized by

dominant cultural patterns and expectations. Within higher education, multicultural efforts are seen on a variety of fronts. Aiken, Anderson, Dinnerstein, Lensink, & MacCorquodale (1987) described the problems of integrating feminist thought into the curriculum. Schuster and Van Dyne (1984, 1985) wrote about the transformation of the liberal arts curriculum and the place of women in the academy. Tierney (1991) highlighted how traditional conceptions of the role of colleges and universities undermine the success and potential of Native American students. Weis (1985) described how black student culture at an urban community college tends to contribute to "the reproduction of a social structure that is strikingly unequal by class and race" (p. 159). Loo and Rolison (1986) elaborated on the alienating experiences of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university. And finally, D'Augelli (1989a, 1989b) noted the problems faced by lesbians and gay men in a university community.

All of the studies mentioned above have a similar goal -- uncovering the problems and causes of the alienating experiences of different groups in academe. They also have a similar hope. They have the hope of constructing multicultural communities where all groups, including conservatives, are accepted as legitimate participants in the pursuit of higher learning free from discrimination.

It is our intent as well to promote multicultural communities. Our argument throughout the remainder of this paper is that the way in which organizations are conceived, whether

modern or postmodern, deters or facilitates the establishment and legitimation of a multicultural environment. It is not simply that we want Native Americans to graduate from college, or lesbians not to be harassed; the point is that Native Americans should graduate and lesbians should attend college without having to compromise their own identities and cultures.

II. Modernist Theories of Organization

"There is no need to belabor the assertion that ours is an organizational society -- that organizations are a prominent, if not dominant, characteristic of modern society" (Scott, 1987, p. 3). Organizations have become an integral part of our social experience and we frequently participate in them unaware of their presence and influence. Given their sometimes intrusive and sometimes unobtrusive nature it seems only fitting that we should study them in order to better assess their impact upon our lives. In doing so, we hope to further our understanding of the structures in which we participate.

Scott (1987) stated that "most analysts have conceived of organizations as social structures created by individuals to support the collaborative pursuit of specified goals" (p. 9). This conception of organizations suggests a commonality of conscious intent. However, it is important to point out that there are many different ways of looking at organizational structures. In an attempt to facilitate comprehension of organizations, several authors (Bolman and Deal, 1984, 1991;

Morgan, 1986; Scott, 1987) have written about the various ways in which we frame organizations. We define "frame" as an interpretive lens that directs our attention toward some characteristics and away from others. It is important to note that we use the terms "frames," "views," and "perspectives" interchangeably in this section of the paper.

This section provide an overview of five of the more prominent modernist ways of looking at organizations, namely the bureaucratic perspective, the human relations perspective, the political perspective, the cybernetic perspective, and the cultural perspective. We group these perspectives under the rubric of modernism which in essence depicts the organization "as a social tool and an extension of human rationality" (Cooper and Burrell, 1988, p. 1). For the purposes of this paper, we define modernism as a philosophical movement rooted in the principle that rationality is the highest of human attributes; a movement which has subsequently directed most human activity toward the ambitions of logical construction.

In discussing these various organizational frames we present their theoretical origins, assumptions, conceptions about the process of organizational change, and the role of the leader in the process of change. Following our discussion is a table that summarizes the essence of modernist organizational frames. The conclusion of this section serves as a brief review of modernist interpretations of organizations -- drawing parallels amongst the perspectives as well as pointing out how modernist conceptions of

organizations can limit our understanding and deter opportunities to promote multicultural communities.

Bureaucratic Perspective

Theoretical Origins

The elaboration of the bureaucratic perspective can be traced to the early twentieth century when several attempts were made to categorize and promote ideas leading to the efficient organization and management of work. Researchers in the field of scientific management (Taylor, 1911; Fayol, 1949; Simon, 1960) recognized the need to systematize the work environment with the idea that rationality would lead to increased productivity.

Assumptions

From the bureaucratic perspective rationality takes precedence over all other forms of thought. Activities and actions are "organized in such a way as to lead to predetermined goals with maximum efficiency" (Scott, 1987, p. 31). This perspective presumes that organizations exist for the sole purpose of achieving goals and goal specificity formally guides behaviors and operations. Decisions are made through a rational process involving the determination of desired results and an examination of the most appropriate means for acquiring those ends.

Weber (1947) provided the following defining characteristics of the bureaucratic form: a fixed division of labor, a hierarchy

of positions, a set of rules and regulations governing behavior, the separation of public and private rights and property, and the selection of participants based upon technical qualifications.

The bureaucratic model assumes that organizations are in a closed system in which there is no interference from or contact with the external environment. Hence, organizations viewed from this perspective are considered to be stable (Scott, 1987).

The Process of Change

From a bureaucratic perspective, change is resisted -- stability is assumed and maintenance of the status quo is favored (Blau, 1956). Additionally, individuals are generally habituated to long established procedures and often resist changes that affect routine. Change is disruptive because it assumes the best method of organizing is already in place and adaptation can deter the flow of production and create inefficiency (Bolman and Deal, 1991).

Therefore, if and when change does occur, it is in reaction to the need to better organize toward the efficient pursuit of goals. Since the bureaucratic form assumes a closed environment, change is internally stimulated. Change in a rational system is also difficult to implement -- structures are held tightly in place and provide little flexibility for adaptation.

Leadership and Change

Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley (1978) described the

bureaucratic leader "as the hero who stands at the top of a complex pyramid of power" (p. 44). This individual maintains the organizational operation and is responsible for defining and formulating purpose. The leader makes decisions and obtains resources that help the organization acquire its goals in an efficient manner. The leader is a planner, director, and organizer and a task oriented individual responsible for solving problems that interfere with goal attainment. Thus, change occurring in the bureaucratic model is likely to be mandated from the top. The leader usually introduces change through the realignment of formal structures in order to facilitate the achievement of goals (Bolman and Deal, 1991).

Human Relations Perspective

Theoretical Origins

The body of literature pertaining to this field grew out of the experimental work of McGregor (1960), Mayo (1945), and Barnard (1938). These researchers recognized the importance of the behavioral component of organizations. Mayo is known for his experiments at the Hawthorne Western Electric Plant, where worker productivity increased under experimental conditions (known as the Hawthorne effect). McGregor noted the importance of creating organizational conditions which facilitate the expression of participant interests in alignment with organizational interests. Barnard contributed by viewing organizations as cooperative systems which integrate the contributions of participants.

Assumptions

From the human relations perspective organizations are social groups composed of individuals with shared values and beliefs about sustaining the organization. In this framework, survival is a major operational goal. Scott (1987) defined organizations seen through this frame as "more than instruments for attaining narrowly defined goals; they are, fundamentally, social groups attempting to adapt and survive in their particular circumstances" (p. 52). This perspective recognizes that an informal structure exists within organizations which is based upon the personal characteristics and contributions of its participants (Barnard, 1938). Individuals help shape organizational composition by their expectations, skills, interests, and values.

This perspective also includes the element of professionalism which recognizes the unique contribution of a specialized, skilled work force within an organization (Corson, 1960; Millet, 1962; Etzioni, 1964). An example is the role of faculty in determining the curriculum of colleges and universities. The concept of professionalism inherently places an emphasis on consensus, shared authority in decision making, common commitments and aspirations of participants, as well as, interaction based upon equality.

The Process of Change

Change in the human resource model involves a desire to

increase worker morale to improve productivity. Modifications are created to meet the needs of individuals in anticipation of creating a better work environment. According to Bolman and Deal (1991) change in this model can be unfavorable -- alterations to practices and procedures can serve to undercut an individual's ability to perform their work with confidence and success. For example, individuals may feel that their work is viewed as ineffective if changes are introduced without their consultation and input. Since decision making by consensus is paramount in this model, change can often be hindered by struggles to achieve consensus. If consensus regarding possible adaptations can not be reached, then change may not occur.

Leadership and Change

Leadership in the human resource model is based upon consultation and collective responsibility. The leader is a facilitator, encourager, and motivator -- a first among equals. The major role of the leader is to articulate the common good of the organization and to promote democratic participation.

Given this perspective, the leader is never solely responsible for inducing change. Instead, the leader's role is to ensure that change is agreed upon through a group decision making process. The leader is also responsible for ensuring that change addresses the needs of employees.

Political Perspective

Theoretical Origins

The early roots of politics and political systems are found in the writings of Aristotle. However, it is the work of contemporary political scientists which provides the link between organizational functions and politics. In doing so, scholars sought to understand the political aspects of organization and the relationship between organizations and constituents (Morgan, 1986). Gamson (1968) was one of the first to provide a comprehensive description of organizational power and the influence of authority and partisan groups.

Assumptions

Political systems are viewed as coalitions composed of varied individuals and interest groups with inherent differences within and between groups based on values, preferences, beliefs and perceptions of reality. Conflict is central to organizational dynamics. Important organizational decisions involve the allocation of scarce resources, which generally determines who gets what and also helps facilitate the formation of dominant coalitions.

Goals and decisions in the political organization emerge through bargaining, negotiation, and vying for power (Bolman and Deal, 1991). The concept of power, within this analysis, is paramount -- it is the vehicle through which participants gain influence. Power is generally associated with the group

responsible for allocating resources, or the group exerting the most influence, or the group that is most valued by the organization.

The Process of Change

Change occurs as a result of a shift in the power structure. It is the result of one group successfully imposing its agenda on the organization. Consequently, change in the political system inherently involves conflict within the organization. Furthermore, it is likely to be ineffective and unsuccessful if it is implemented without the support of dominant interest groups. Bolman and Deal (1991) stated that political organizations never change and yet, are constantly changing. In other words, there is a constant maneuvering for position rendering radical change highly improbable. Since coalitions are in perpetual conflict with one another opportunities for change are minimal (Baldridge, 1971).

Leadership and Change

The leader of a political organization is a mediator and negotiator between power blocks. The leader's role is to pull coalitions together in order to achieve goal consensus. The political leader is a policy maker, a diplomat, and a compromiser. The major roles are to "help the community manage its own affairs, to assist in the process by which issues are deliberated and judgements reached, and to take the actions

necessary to implement decisions" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 147).

Catalytic leadership is considered one of the more effective forms of leadership in the political system (Whetten, 1984; Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). This type of leadership involves the process of gaining group solidarity and commitment by defining organizational mission and purpose that is in alignment with the interests of various coalitions (Whetten, 1984; Hollander, 1985).

Cybernetic Perspective

Theoretical Origins

The theoretical origins of the cybernetic perspective can be found in the fields of information theory, mathematical logic, and operations research (Scott, 1987; Morgan, 1986). The term was coined by Wiener (1961) to describe the process of information exchange used in self-regulating behavior by machines and organisms to maintain system operations. Steinbruner (1974) and Swinth (1974) later applied the term to organizational structures in terms of policy determination stressing the use of environmental input and a non-linear decision making process.

Assumptions

A cybernetic perspective describes the organization as a set of interdependent parts with varying degrees of connectedness. Such a characterization likens the organization to a thermostat--the organization is composed of several units, which when working

together in a flexible manner, serve to regulate and maintain the operations at a level consistent with external influences (Scott, 1987; Morgan, 1986).

A major characteristic of this perspective is interaction with the external environment; a cybernetic organization relies on cues from the environment for its regulation. A second characteristic is self-maintenance based upon the acquisition of resources and information from the environment. In accordance with the thermostat analogy, cybernetic systems have sensors that monitor the environment and communication occurs through "flows" to other units which provide information about changes and adaptation. Birnbaum (1988) provided the following description of cybernetic controls, "self-correcting mechanisms that monitor organizational functions and provide attention cues, or negative feedback, to participants when things are not going well" (p. 179).

Focus in the cybernetic system is generally upon inputs and regulation, as opposed to outputs (Scott, 1987; Birnbaum, 1988). Maintaining equilibrium is a major organizational goal. Therefore, cybernetic systems are goal oriented, but not goal directed; action is based upon sus ining the system and not upon achieving specific end results.

The Process of Change

Change is an inherent part of the cybernetic system. Organizations are constantly sensing their environment and

responding through internal adaptation. Consequently, change is generally initiated from the outside and the system responds in an effort to counterbalance unexpected disturbances or demands. In other words, change is equilibrium oriented.

Leadership and Change

The leadership function within a cybernetic system is primarily to maintain the system. The leader must ensure that the organization runs smoothly and that appropriate monitoring devices exist to ensure homeostasisity. Since a cybernetic organization is theoretically self-correcting, leadership is only necessary when problems emerge that the system is not designed to account for (Bensimon et al., 1989). Consequently, leadership is reactive in nature.

Cultural Perspective

Theoretical Origins

The roots of the cultural perspective are found in anthropology and sociology. Durkheim (1934) linked the concept of culture to organizations when studying the disintegration of traditional patterns of social order in favor of a complex division of labor. The application of culture to business and industry began with the work of Ouchi (1981) who studied the impact of the philosophical nature of Japanese business firms upon employees and subsequent productivity.

Assumptions

Culture depicts the basic beliefs exhibited by members of an organization typically evidenced in their attitudes, rituals and ceremonies. Davis (1984) discussed the impact of an organization's guiding beliefs upon the improvement of goal formation and practices of strategic planning. This perspective emphasizes the importance of understanding cultural elements and how such an understanding can help facilitate organizational operations (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1983; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Schwartz and Davis, 1981). Culture can promote decision making, minimize conflict, and foster the development of shared goals (Tierney, 1988).

The Process of Change

Change is introduced to foster goal development and to improve management and institutional performance. Change occurs as beliefs are modified through the manipulation of cultural elements. In other words, change is implemented by altering or introducing rituals and ceremonies that reinforce adaptations as well as replace the previously accepted symbols. For example, an organization wishing to increase the effective use of employee time may reduce coffee breaks, and instead introduce athletic facilities to be used during work breaks in an effort to sustain a symbolic concern for employee health and morale.

Leadership and Change

The role of the leader from this perspective is to recognize and understand how cultural elements contribute to the nature of the organization. A major leadership objective is to develop a strong organization that utilizes cultural elements to the organization's advantage, which of course is tied to productivity. The leader's role is to also ensure that change is adequately accepted by organizational participants. This is done by providing appropriate symbols that contribute to organizational operations.

Summary

In this section we have discussed five organizational frames and the different characteristics that can be elucidated when employing each frame. As mentioned earlier, we have grouped these frames under the rubric of modernism because of their emphasis on structures related to rationality, efficiency, and the allocation of scarce resources. While these frames each describe different aspects of organizations, they share in common the perspective that organizations are instruments of control and production. They exist as identifiable entities having objective purposes.

The implication of organizations being classified and described in terms of frames or typologies is that in essence they take on the identities by which they are defined -- they become objects as much as processes. The categorization of

organizations leads us to think of them in terms of the definable characteristics presented in this section. Viewing organizations as entities with identifiable characteristics serves to limit the way we think of them as well as constrain the way we think about implementing change and innovation within them. Therefore, we argue that modernist conceptions underestimate the complexity of human organization by adopting such instrumental stances.

The intent of this section is to point out that modernist frames of organizations stress concerns that do not necessarily promote multiculturalism. By making this statement we do not contend that efficiency is unimportant, but instead, we suggest that there are other concerns which are equally important to the organization which become subordinated when rationality and goals are emphasized. In other words, viewing an organization through a modernist lens can deter our ability to acknowledge and change the marginalization of groups because the focus is upon structure and not upon human characteristics. Therefore, in the next section we provide an alternative approach which presents an organizational structure that allows for the existence of multicultural communities.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF MODERNIST THEORIES OF ORGANIZATIONS

	Bureaucratic	Human Resource	Political	Cybernetic	Cultural
Origins	Scientific Management	Social Psychology	Political Science	Information Theory Mathematical Logic Behavioral Psychology	Anthropology Sociology
Authors	Taylor Simon Fayol Weber	McGregor Mayo Likert	Gamson Edelman Pfeffer	Wiener Swinth Steinbruner	Ouchi Deal & Kennedy Peters & Waterman
Assumptions	Rationality Goal oriented Hierarchy Formal rules & regulations Impersonal	Social collectives Loyalties & commitments Survival Professionalism Shared decision making	Coalitions Power Conflict Bargaining Negotiation Decisions involve scarce resources Special interest groups	Interdependent parts Self-correcting Non-linear Feedback loops	Shared beliefs, norms, values, rituals and symbols Web of meaning Normative order Living historical product
Change	Realignment of formal structure Efficiency Goal oriented	Morale oriented Meets needs of people Increase productivity	Shift in power structure Slow Progressive	Constant adjustment to external environment Equilibrium oriented	Foster goal development Improve management & institutional performance Minimize conflict Overcome problems
Leadership	Maintains & directs operations Defines purpose Makes decisions Solves problems Task oriented	Consultative Encourager Motivator Shares decision-making Facilitator Democratic participative	Mediator Negotiator Creates consensus Policy maker Diplomat Compromiser	Maintains system Monitors feedback loops Responds to problems Reactive	Instrumental Manages meaning Maintains belief system

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. A Postmodern Conception of Organizations

The previous section outlined some of the more significant modernist interpretations of organizations. In this section we discuss more recent developments related to postmodernism and organizational understanding. Central to our discussion is the concept of culture and how modern and postmodern conceptions differ. In discussing culture, we consider its relation to issues of power and domination. We then link recent organizational research by feminist scholars and critical theorists to postmodern conceptions of organization, and elaborate how such views are helpful in promoting multicultural communities. We conclude with a discussion of the role leaders play in promoting organizational change, specifically focusing on the role of leaders in encouraging a variety of voices to be heard.

Underlying Assumptions

Cooper and Burrell (1988) highlighted a significant difference between a modernist conception of organization and a postmodernist view:

> In the modernist model, organization is viewed as a social tool and an extension of human rationality. In the postmodern view, organization is less the expression of planned thought and calculative action and a more defensive reaction to forces intrinsic to the social body which constantly threaten the stability of organized life. (p. 91)

When they discussed "forces intrinsic to the social body" Cooper and Burrell noted an important aspect of a postmodern analysis --

organizations emerge out of human action and once constituted, they develop a life of their own that tends to restrict and confine human action.

The objective then for the organizational analyst is not to measure or control various organizational variables in order to gain understanding, but instead, the concern is to develop a sense for how the organization shapes and is shaped by the interaction of participants. Postmodern interpretations emphasize how individuals construct their social worlds while at the same time being shaped by a complexity of organizational forces. Greenfield (1980) noted that "Individuals not only create the organization, they are the organization" (p. 556).

The notion that people are both created and the creators of organization is inherent in the work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault. For Foucault (1977), organizations represent human constructions designed primarily to maintain social order and control. Organizational maintenance of social order results in the loss of personal control as participants' thoughts and actions become entangled in organizational structures. While this is both a shortened and simplified account of Foucault's complex thought, it nonetheless touches on a basic tenet of his analysis. Foucault's view of organizations differs significantly from modernist conceptions. Modernists, on the one hand, argue that organizationally enhanced social order results in greater productivity -- in essence, people are freed to concentrate on important organizational tasks. On the other hand, Foucault sees

the nature of modern organization as largely imprisoning.

The goal of postmodern analysis is to come to terms with organizational structures and forces that limit or restrict action, while at the same time, understanding how action continually reshapes social organization. This view of organization is different from modern conceptions which emphasize rationality and generally fail to question the debilitating aspects of social control and order.

In understanding the differences between modern and postmodern conceptions of organizations it may be helpful to also examine the premodern. On the following page we include a table adapted from Lather (1991) that is helpful in this regard.

Culture and Power

Fundamental to a postmodern conception of organization is the role of culture in structuring the experiences of organizational participants. From this perspective, culture is seen as analogous to organization. Smircich (1983) elaborated:

> Culture as a root metaphor for organizations goes beyond the instrumental view of organization derived from the machine metaphor and beyond the adaptive view derived from the organismic metaphor. Culture as a root metaphor promotes a view of organizations as expressive forms, manifestations of human consciousness. Organizations are understood and analyzed not mainly in economic terms, but in terms of their expressive, ideational, and symbolic aspects. Characterized very broadly, the research agenda stemming from this perspective is to explore the phenomenon of organization as subjective experience and to investigate the patterns that make action possible. (p. 347-348)

Table 2: Charting Postmodernism

	Premodern	Modern	Postmodern
Form of authority, legitimate knowledge	The sacred:church/state theocracy, divinely sanctioned consensus. Few alternate codifications of knowledge	Secular humanism: individual reason = scientific, liberal democracy. Ideological state apparatuses central dispensers of codified knowledge: schools and science especially	Postmodern of Reaction Collapse of meaning, nihilism, schizocynicism Postmodern of Resistance Participatory, dialogic & pluralistic structures of authority. Non-dualistic, anti-hierarchical
Conception of individual	God-given, destined. Religious human	Humanism Autonomous individualism self-directive, natural rights, shapable, potentially fully conscious, refusal to accept limits. Socio-political human, producer	Post-humanism Decentered subject, culturally inscribed/constructed, contradictory, relational, valorise unconscious; foreground limits. Cyborg: continuously re-created & re-creating via technology PM of Reaction: fractured, schizoid consumer. PM of Resistance: subject-in-process, capable of agency & ego integration within fluidity
Material base	Feudal economy	Industrial Age Navigation, gunpowder, printing press. Various forms of nation-state capitalism. Bureaucratic rationalization	Information Age Nuclear power and micro-electronic global capitalism
View of history	Static, divinely ordered	Linear, progressive change = teleological. Ignorance-enlightenment-emancipation = inevitable trajectory. Doctrine of eventual secular salvation via human rationality, especially science	Non-linear, cyclical, indeterminate, discontinuous, contingent. Focus on the present as history, the past as fiction of the present
Place of community/tradition	Commitment to what is fixed and enduring	Valorise change; dualism of individual vs. cultural embeddedness	PM of Reaction:Increased normalization & regulation PM of Resistance: Difference without opposition. Personal autonomy and social relatedness. Self without estrangement

Adapted from P. Lather (1991).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A postmodern view of organizations places culture at the center of organizational analysis. From this perspective, culture is more than the attitudes, beliefs, and rituals expressed by organizational members. Instead, organizational culture encompasses the very nature of the way language, knowledge, and reality are understood. Culture is seen as the major factor in the way organizational members define their social experiences; in other words, the construction of participants' reality is tied to social factors emanating from culture.

Postmodern and modern organizational perspectives differ in their view of culture. Modern perspectives emphasize culture as an outcome of human organization; they depict culture primarily as something that organizational members create, often purposefully. While postmodern interpretations also portray culture as an outcome of human interaction, it is also seen as the shaper of interaction. The complex relationship between culture and social interaction pose a problem for organizational participants who seek prediction and rational manipulation. Hence, as organizational members we are subject to cultural constraints. Or in Foucault's thinking, we are imprisoned by our own creations.

Modern conceptions of culture are frequently referred to as instrumental views since culture is seen as something that can be manipulated and molded to serve organizational needs. Instrumental perspectives of culture focus on identifying and measuring elements or artifacts of culture for the purpose of

controlling organizational outputs. Strong organizations are those that can utilize cultural variables to their advantage, either through modifying the organizational culture or through adjusting institutional strategies (Davis, 1984; Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981, 1983; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Schwartz and Davis, 1981).

While modern views of culture focus on identifying various concepts considered to be indicative of culture, such as rituals, beliefs, attitudes, and values, postmodern approaches focus on the complex relationship between the organization and its members. For postmodernists, elements of culture are seen as aspects of a complex maze of social behavior that help to create meaning for organizational members. In essence, postmodern interpretations argue that all aspects of organized behavior express culture and inform human beliefs, attitudes, and values.

Essential to understanding the relationship between culture and organizational behavior from a postmodern perspective is the role that power plays in shaping the social world of organizational members. The social construction of participants' realities is emphasized in postmodern analysis; hence, knowledge, facts, and indeed experience, become political issues open for debate and interpretation (Foucault, 1972). Power is evidenced by the ability of some members of a given society or social order to legitimate their version of reality, while at the same time suppressing the realities and experiences of others.

A postmodern analysis of organizational culture emphasizes

power relations. To be more clear, various organizational members and groups must be understood in relation to their ability to participate in organizational decision making -- in essence, their ability to enact power must be examined. It is a postmodern emphasis on power and the politically contested nature of culture that provide critical notions helpful toward understanding academic communities where various participants have been rendered voiceless.

A number of researchers have emphasized the role of culture in studying higher education settings (Becher, 1981; Becker, 1972; Bushnell, 1967; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Clark, 1970, 1987; Clark & Trow, 1966; Dill, 1982; Hughes, Becker, & Geer, 1962; Newcomb, 1968; Riesman & Jencks, 1967; Wallace, 1966). While the preceding research efforts focused on cultural aspects of higher education, they lack the critical nature of research framed by feminist theory and critical theory and evident in the work of Bensimon (1989), Holland & Eisenhart (1990), McLaughlin (1991), Sanday (1990), Tierney (1989, 1991), and Weis (1985).

Despite differences between critical theory and feminist theory in relation to postmodern thought, we group both under the rubric of postmodernism because of their emphasis on the socially constructed nature of reality and the role of culture and power in shaping human action and perception. Crucial to our inclusion of feminist and critical theory is the way such views encourage the empowerment of marginalized people necessary for the development of diverse academic communities.

Critical Theory & Feminist Theory

Critical and feminist theorists focus on how various societal groups are denied opportunities for involvement in the construction of organizational reality by dominant cultural structures. In other words, critical theorists and feminists concern themselves with the marginalized members of organizations and society. While both perspectives primarily adopt a critical analysis of culture and power -- critical in the sense that analysis focuses on awareness of the constructed nature of social structures -- they go one step further in seeking to unite theory and practice. In a discussion of critical theory, Bernstein (1976) elaborated on the union of theory and praxis:

> Critical theorists see the distinction between theory and practice which is accepted by advocates of traditional theory, as itself an ideological reflection of a society in which "theory" only serves to foster the status quo. By way of contrast, critical theory seeks a genuine unity of theory and revolutionary praxis where theoretical understanding of the contradictions inherent in existing society, when appropriated by those who are exploited, becomes constitutive of their very activity to transform society. (p. 182)

In other words, the goal in academe is not simply to understand the complex web of organizational meaning but to ultimately change academic institutions so that the voiceless are no longer silent.

Feminist critiques examine the predominant influence of patriarchy in structuring the nature of organizational thought and practice (Blackmore, 1989, Carroll, 1984; Ferguson, 1984). The project of feminist critique is to reconstruct theories of

organizations and leadership on the basis of women's experiences. The principal focus for critical theorists hinges on how dominant cultural patterns have rendered marginalized groups powerless. Culture is seen not as a value-free concept, but instead to critical and feminist theorists, culture is seen as a value-laden social construction legitimated through the enactment of power by various social groups.

The Role of Leaders

If organizations are viewed through a critical or feminist lens where the concepts of domination and power are prevalent and the notion of change is paramount, how then are leaders to perform their responsibilities? The answer to this question is inherent in the idea of transformational leadership put forth by Burns (1978). For Burns, transformational leaders concern themselves with moral issues inherent in the make-up of organizations. In relation to critical and feminist conceptions of organizations, transformational leaders must concern themselves with how various participants or nonparticipants are marginalized by the nature of their organizational relationship or through their exclusion from participation. Tierney and Foster (1989), in building upon Burns' notion of transformational leadership, offered the following:

> Transformative leadership concerns the ability of individuals or groups to structure organizational discourse around the nature of social relations and values. It involves a concern for creating a community of critical, reflective citizens. If organizational life represents a struggle for meaning, then we are calling for transformative

> leaders who are centrally concerned with issues of social justice and empowerment, whose overriding commitment is on behalf of the disadvantaged and dispossessed. (p. 3)

This perspective of leadership differs from more traditional modernist conceptions that emphasize power and control or specific traits or skills such as charisma that leaders must possess. Smyth (1989) highlighted a critical conception of educational leadership when he wrote, "Whatever leadership acts are, they probably have more to do with processes of communicating understanding, developing a sense of community and reconstituting the power relationships which get in the way of educative processes in schools" (p. 4).

Also implicit in transformational leadership is the organizational location of the leader. Transformational leaders can exist anywhere within the organization and are not necessarily the formally designated leaders. Transformational leadership perspectives differentiate leadership from management. Foster (1989) is helpful here:

> Leadership is not organizational management, and it is of no use to the concept of leadership continually to equate it with position or management effectiveness. It is crucial to understand that while leadership may occur in organizational settings, and may be exercised by position holders, there is no necessary or logical link between the two concepts. (p.45)

We emphasize transformational leadership because it fits closely with the development of multicultural communities. Including a variety of voices from previously excluded peoples is necessarily a moral issue and transformational leaders concern themselves with moral issues. The creation of diverse

communities is not a one person job but requires instead the mobilization of many organizational participants around important community issues. Transformational leaders encourage community discussion and awareness of problems that previously might have been suppressed. And finally, creating multicultural communities involves reconstituting relations of power. Transformational leaders concern themselves with the disempowered and their subsequent empowerment.

Summary

The point of this section is that we no longer live in a modern world -- we live in a post-industrial or postmodern society where social life has become increasingly complex and variable. As Gergen (1991) noted, we are "saturated" with social contexts that make impossible homogeneous communities and singular realities or visions of the world. Gergen elucidated:

> The postmodern condition more generally is marked by a plurality of voices vying for the right to reality -- to be accepted as legitimate expressions of the true and the good. As the voices expand in power and presence, all that seemed proper, right-minded, and well understood is subverted.(p.7)

A postmodern perspective reminds us that our traditional ways of seeing the organization of academe as well as curricula need to be revised. We are in the midst of literally a multicultural explosion and our colleges and universities need to reflect the diverse peoples encompassing the social fabric of society. The goal of academe is to include the variety of peoples who up to now have been marginalized by dominant cultural

structures both inside and outside the academy.

We argue that feminist theory and critical theory offer frames for understanding the role that power plays in the marginalization of some cultural groups. We also highlight the role that transformational leaders can play in promoting multicultural academic communities. In the next section we discuss various attempts to create academic organizations where a variety of voices are heard. While we focus primarily upon the curriculum, we emphasize that the development of multicultural communities involves more than curricular innovation but also calls attention to the organization of academic institutions.

IV. Curricular Change

Thus far we have presented an introduction to the general debate in higher education between conservative educators and multiculturalists and a discussion of modern and postmodern conceptions of organization. In so doing, we contend that the use of postmodern organizational analysis provides the possibility for the curricular change that is called for by multicultural educators.

In this section we make connections between larger organizational frameworks and change in curricula. This will be done by first presenting differing conceptions of knowledge and how they inform curricular decision making. Next, we look at how curricular change has traditionally taken place in institutions of higher education utilizing a modern approach. Next, we

examine how postmodern curricular change takes place, followed by an example of postmodern change in the curriculum utilizing women's studies. Finally, we discuss the building of academic communities of difference by focusing on transformation of the curriculum. One caveat is in order: when we refer to curricular change we are talking about curricular transformation -- change that is all-encompassing and across the board.

Knowledge: Objective Reality or Social Construction?

In the introduction of this paper, we presented the general curricular debate between conservative and multicultural educators. At the heart of this exchange is the definition of knowledge on which education is built. The conservative viewpoint assumes that an objective reality and a body of knowledge exist that is "out there" for students to obtain. The educational experience is to find, unearth, and experience a common core of knowledge that is thought to be known and the same for all students.

On the other hand, postmodernists believe that knowledge starts from individual experience and is mediated by one's gender, social class, race, etc., thus refuting the idea of a single and universal truth. Knowledge as something that is fixed and objective is viewed as limiting, narrow, ethnocentric, and unfeasible. Multiculturalists show that what has been taken for universal and generalizable knowledge is in fact political and pervasive. Accordingly, their task is to reconstruct the

curriculum so as to expose the many existences -- women, lesbians and gays, Latinos, etc. -- that fall outside the culture. The intent is to bring the margins to the center.

The curriculum encompasses what an academic institution ideologically represents and serves as an indicator of larger societal and academic trends. "As a formal medium for communicating knowledge within the university, the curriculum is heavily influenced by the prevailing events, values, and beliefs of the society in which it is situated" (Haworth & Conrad, 1990, p. 6). While the curriculum is at least in part shaped by such prevailing societal trends, the organizational structure is also instrumental in influencing the tenor of the curriculum as well as one's conception of knowledge.

The curriculum is intrinsically tied to the organizational structure; both are outgrowths of a certain world view. In sections two and three we presented the theoretical assumptions of the modern and postmodern perspectives of organizations and how the conception of reality embraced by these perspectives informs and helps shape the organization. Similarly, the construction of knowledge informs the shape and content of the curriculum. Therefore, we argue that curricular innovation must go hand in hand with campus-wide change which emphasizes the political nature of curricular decision making.

Modern Approaches to Change

In the second section of this paper we presented modernist

theories of organization. Modernism is grounded in the philosophical notion that rationality is the highest of human attributes. This perception is in line with a conservative view of the curriculum that rationality is the desired outcome of experiencing the truth -- an objective set of knowledge. A modern approach to the curriculum assumes an objective reality and a body of knowledge that is "out there."

The literature associated with curricular transformation is inundated with calls for change that imply rationality within the organizational context. For example, Bergquist (1977) discussed the necessity of curricular change and the difficulties institutions face with implementation. He suggests specific steps institutions should take before, during, and after curriculum change; steps such as review of current curricula, preparing the institution for change and setting up a concise plan of action. Such a step-by-step approach to curricular adjustment suggests that organizations are rational, receptive, and open to such outcome-oriented change. This conception of curricular change is in line with a modern view of organizational change for it focuses on rationality and goal specificity. Dressel (1968) and Mayhew and Ford (1971) presented more rational approaches to changing the curriculum as well.

According to Birnbaum (1988) such rationality implies as a first step the articulation of objectives. Further, administrative expectations suggest that an organization will move in a rational, linear, and sequential manner toward the

achievement of certain sets of goals. This rational approach is outcome-oriented rather than process-focused. Birnbaum stated, "rationality assumes that the purpose of decision making is to create outcomes that maximize the values of the decision maker" (p.56). A rational approach to curricular change abandons the tenet of responsiveness to individual participants and further disregards any idea of knowledge that is not objective.

Postmodern Approaches to Curricular Change

A postmodern conception of organization is in line with a multicultural perspective of curriculum -- both assume the social construction of reality and knowledge. In the postmodern organization curriculum that reflects a multicultural reality seeks to give voice to marginalized groups in higher education. It is the relationship between postmodern organizations and the multicultural curriculum that is instrumental in building communities of difference. Postmodern perspectives of organizations and approaches to changing curriculum focus on the social construction of reality and the expressed culture of an organization.

A postmodern perspective of curricular change as presented by Gumport (1988) embodies departure from traditional ideas about initiating, designing, and implementing change. She responds to more rationalistic approaches to changing the curriculum with a cultural construction which is in line with a postmodern analysis:

> Applying this analytical lens [cultural] to curricula and curricular change shifts our attention away from such conventional measures as resource allocations, courses, degree requirements, and syllabi and toward the cultural life underlying these artifacts. Rather than indicating fairly stable, shared understandings about what constitutes academic knowledge and what knowledge is most worth transmitting, curricula may be only signposts of evolving commitments. (p. 49-50)

Further, Gumport discussed the assumptive notions pertaining to academic knowledge in the curriculum and the organizational context:

> Curricula, the institutional embodiment of individual and organizational commitments to certain academic understandings, reflect what currently counts as legitimate academic knowledge. Curricular change, then, signifies changes in a faculty's underlying assumptions about what counts as knowledge.... It is the scholarly commitments of faculty and the subcultures they produce, that constitute curricula's dynamic foundations (p. 55).

The curriculum of an academic institution ideologically represents and expresses what an organization portrays. Utilizing Gumport's (1988) analysis, curricula are a "signpost of cultural change" which further affirms Smircich's (1983) use of culture as the root metaphor of an organization. Culture is intrinsic to understanding an organization, culture is something that an organization is, not something it possesses. The cultures of higher education institutions are intricately tied to the university curricula. Changes to one inherently affect changes to the other and thus curricular and organizational structures must be considered in an interactive manner.

Women's Studies: An Example of Postmodern Curricular Change

The work of Schuster and Van Dyne (1984) presented a process

of curricular change that is broad in perspective and considers the organizational arena wherein change takes place. They propose a review that goes beyond individual classes and looks to the structure of academe to find out why the experience of women has been ignored. The focus of their work is the experience of women and the challenge of changing traditional curricular structures.

A notable contribution of the work of Schuster and Van Dyne (1984) is the naming of invisible paradigms, which are defined accordingly:

> They are, to use another image to make the invisible visible, the infrastructure of our academic system: the internalized assumptions, the network of unspoken agreements, the implicit contracts that all participants in the process of higher education have agreed to, usually unconsciously, in order to bring about learning (p. 417).

It is these "invisible paradigms" that are the cornerstone of resistance to curricular change initiatives and are pervasive throughout institutions of higher education. Invisible paradigms can be thought of as institutional social prescriptions that seek to maintain the status quo. Academic institutions are embedded with traditional notions and the invisible paradigms are a mechanism that perpetuate tradition. This is not to say that tradition is negative; however, in higher education many of the foundational traditions have been exclusive of women and other traditionally underrepresented groups. Examination of the organizational structure in addition to curricular formations hopes to make visible the invisible as the focus of resistance.

Illumination of the invisible will not eliminate opposition for "resistance is more of a characteristic response to change than acceptance" (Corbett, Firestone and Rossman; 1987, p. 36). However, acknowledgement of the tenets of the traditional canon as a barrier to progressive change provides a realistic point of departure for approaching curricular change.

The literature offers other examples in women's studies to highlight the process of curricular change. Tetrault (1985), Schuster and Van Dyne (1984, 1985); Aiken et al. (1987) and McIntosh (in Anderson, 1987) all presented theories of change that utilize stages to identify the process of curricular transformation. For example, Schuster and Van Dyne (1984) identified six stages: invisible women, search for missing women, women as a subordinate group, women studied on their own terms, women as a challenge to the disciplines, and the transformed curriculum. The stages are neither sequential nor fixed. The intent of the stages is to highlight how the inclusion of women in higher education curricula may take place.

Utilization of the work on transformation efforts by women's studies scholars is helpful in a postmodern analysis for it takes into consideration the social construction of reality by bringing the experience of women to the core of what counts as knowledge. Postmodernists deal with people as the collectivity and root of change instead of the formalized structure of organization. For example, the work of Aiken et al (1987) focused on faculty development to create a gender-balanced curriculum. This, unlike

a modern approach, works with people to bring about change -- the target is process, not formalized structure or goals. The curriculum is tied to the culture of an institution and so too is the culture tied to the organization's participants. Working with individuals provides a means to work from the bottom up in the change process. While successful curricular transformation is not a matter of changing a syllabi or two, aiming to transform faculty who are an integral part of the organizational culture provides a start.

Transformation of the curriculum through special studies programs happens neither expeditiously nor without resistance. The stages outlined facilitate understanding of what takes place and how; once we know how successful change takes place, that information can be used to make change more pervasive.

Building Communities of Difference

A curriculum is a reflection of the world view of the individuals and institutions that have created it. Just as we have shown that the organizational structure of institutions of higher education both arises from and perpetuates a rational, modernist perspective, so it is with a curriculum. The contemporary curriculum takes as a largely unstated assumption the rational belief in a single, objective reality, a truth everywhere the same. A consequence of this belief is the same rigidity that plagues modernist organizations, i.e., that there is one best way to do things (which is the way of the embedded

power structure that created it), and that way must be taught and perpetuated. In the curriculum, this rigidity manifests itself as a belief that there is an objective truth or reality to be reached, and one way to reach it. Such a rigid construction of knowledge has difficulty accepting new voices, viewpoints, and other truths.

We need to expand our conception of knowledge and truth to accept a multitude of backgrounds and voices, and to take the opportunity to learn from traditions different from those that have shaped the current curriculum. Obviously, this will not be easy; change in the curriculum will embody the same challenges that we outlined in regard to the organization as a whole. The challenge is not simply to restructure the guidelines in a rational fashion, but to give credence to traditionally marginalized groups so at last a community of difference can be built.

V. Conclusion

In the beginning of this paper we introduced the issues surrounding the current debate for curricular change. We presented the conservative stance, supported by Bennett, Bloom, and D'Souza, that favors a classical education built on the commonalities of Western culture. In response, we discussed the ideas of multiculturalists who favor a curriculum of inclusion and who view the curricular process as a political struggle where the dominant group possesses the power to determine

organizational and curricular structures. Throughout this paper we used this debate to frame our argument that postmodern conceptions of organization, change, and leadership favor the building of a curriculum that is inclusive of a variety of diverse groups.

While the emphasis of this paper has been on the importance of building academic communities of difference by creating curricular change which addresses the inclusion of marginalized groups, we also discussed organizational theory and how different conceptions of organizations perceive change and leadership. We included the discussion of organizations because an understanding of organization, whether that perception is modern or postmodern, is crucial to making the changes that many contemporary scholars of higher education advocate. Viewing organizations from a modern perspective serves to limit our understanding of them; it creates a tendency to view behavior as initiated and created for the organization, as opposed to a place where individuals exist and interact as social beings -- the postmodern organization.

In this paper we linked the calls from multiculturalists with a postmodern conception of organizations, change, and leadership. In doing so, we suggested that a curriculum built upon the recognition of diverse groups requires an understanding that knowledge is socially constructed and politically contended, as are the organizations (i.e. colleges and universities) in which curriculum is housed. Given this perspective, curricular innovation which takes into consideration the experience of all

participants is an approach, that is in our view, preferable to that of the traditional, modernist approach which simply focuses on structure, process, and goals.

Institutions of higher education are increasingly comprised of diverse populations. In order to maintain the integrity of academe, curricular and organizational structures need to be responsive to the constituencies they serve. Demographically our nation is changing and that change is reflected on campuses throughout the country. In order to keep stride with larger societal trends, colleges and universities need to create organizations and curricula that are instrumental in building and nurturing communities of difference.

References

Aiken, S. H., Anderson, K., Dinnerstein, M., Lensink, J., & MacCorquodale, P. (1987). Trying transformations: Curriculum integration and the problem of resistance. Signs, 12(2), 255-275.

Althusser, L. (1970). Reading "Capital." London: New Left Books.

Anderson, M. (1987). Changing the curriculum in higher education. Signs, 12(2), 222-254.

Baldridge, V. J. (1971). Power and conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations. New York: Wiley.

Baldridge, V. J., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. (1978). Policy making and effective leadership: A national study of academic management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Becher, T. (1981). Toward a definition of disciplinary cultures. Studies in Higher Education, 6(2), 109-122.

Becker, H. S. (1972). What do they really learn in college? In K. A. Feldman (ED.), College and student: Selected readings in the social psychology of higher education (pp. 103-108). New York: Pergamon Press.

Bennett, W. J. (1984). To reclaim a legacy: A report on the humanities in higher education. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Bensimon, E. M. (1989). A feminist reinterpretation of presidents' definitions of leadership. The Peabody Journal 66(3), 143-156.

Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Bergquist, W. H. (1977). Curricular practice. In A. W. Chickering, D. Halliburton, W. H. Bergquist, & J. Lindquist (Eds.), Developing the college curriculum (pp. 77-109). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Bernstein, B. (1977). Class, codes and control (Vol 3). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, R. J. (1976). The restructuring of social and political theory. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 93-129). London: Falmer Press.

Blau, P. (1956). Bureaucracy in modern society. New York: Random House.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Bushnell, J. H. (1967). Student culture at Vassar. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning (pp. 489-514). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Carroll, S. J. (1984). Feminist scholarship on political leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 139-156). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). Collegiate culture and leadership strategy. New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing.

Clark, B. R. (1970). The distinctive college: Reed, Antioch, and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine.

Clark, B. R. (1987). The academic life. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, B. R. & Trow, M. (1966). The organizational context. In T. M. Newcomb and E. K. Wilson (Eds.), College peer groups: Problems and prospects for research. Chicago: Aldine.

Conrad, C. F. & Pratt, A. (1983). Making decisions about the curriculum. Journal of Higher Education, 54(1), 16-30.

Cooper, R., & Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, post modernism and organizational analysis: An introduction. Organization Studies, 9(1), 91-112.

Corbett, J., Firestone, W., & Rossman, G. (1987). Resistance to planned change and the sacred in school cultures. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 36-59.

Corson, J. J. (1960). The governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989a). The development of a helping community for lesbians and gay men: A case study in community psychology. Journal of Community Psychology, 17, 18-29.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989b). Homophobia in a university community: Views of prospective resident assistants. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 546-552.

Davis, S. M. (1984). Managing corporate culture. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience & education. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Dill, D. D. (1982). The management of academic culture: Notes on the management of meaning and social integration. Higher Education, 11, 303-320.

Dressel, P. M. (1968). College and university curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan.

D'Souza, D. (1991). Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus. New York: Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1934). The division of labour in society. London: Macmillan.

Eckert, P. (1989). Jocks & burnouts: Social categories and identities in the high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eisner, E. (1979). The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan.

Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fayol, H. (1949). General and industrial management. London: Pitman.

Ferguson, K. E. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 39-62). London: The Falmer Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: The Seabury Press.

Gamson, W. A. (1968). Power and discontent. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Gergen, K. J. (1991). The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life. New York: Basic Books.

Giroux, H. A. (1983). Theory & resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1986). Authority, intellectuals, and the politics of practical learning. Teachers College Record, 88(1), 22-40.

Greenfield, T. B. (1980). The man who comes back through the door in the wall: Discovering truth, discovering self, discovering organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(3), 26-59.

Gumport, P. J. (1988). Curricula as signposts of cultural change. The Review of Higher Education, 12(1), 49-61

Haworth, J. G., & Conrad, C. F. (1990). Curriculum in transition: Perspectives on the undergraduate experience. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.

Hill, P. J. (1991). Multi-culturalism, the crucial philosophical and organizational issues. Change, 23(4), 38-47.

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Holland, D. C., & Eisenhart, M. A. (1990). Educated in romance: Women, achievement, and college culture. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hollander, E. P. (1985). Leadership and power. In G. Lindsey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Hughes, E., Becker, H., Geer, B. (1962). Student culture and academic effort. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning (pp. 515-530). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lather, P. (1991). Feminist research in education: Within/against. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University

Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university. Journal of Higher Education, 57(1), 58-77.

Mayhew, L. B., & Ford, P. J. (1971). Changing the curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mayo, E. (1945). The social problems of an industrial civilization. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McLaren, P. (1980). Cries from the corridor. London: Methuen.

McLaughlin, D. (1991). When literary empowers: An ethnography of uses for English and Navajo print. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Millett, J. D. (1962). The academic community: An essay on organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Newcomb, T. M. (1968). Student peer group influence. In K. Yamamoto (Ed.), The college student and his culture: An analysis (pp. 230-238). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Theory Z. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ouchi, W. G. (1983). Theory Z: An elaboration of methodology and findings. Journal of Contemporary Business, 11, 27-41.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Riesman, D., & Jencks, C. (1967). The viability of the American college. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning (pp. 74-192). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rossides, D. W. (1984). What is the purpose of education? Change, 16(3), 14-46.

Sanday, P. (1990) Fraternity gang rape. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schuster, M., & Van Dyne, S. (1984). Placing women in the liberal arts: Stages of curriculum transformation. Harvard Educational Review, 54(4), 413-428.

Schuster, M. R. & Van Dyne, S. R. (1985). Women's place in the academy: Transforming the liberal arts curriculum. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Schwartz, H., & Davis, S. (1981). Matching corporate culture and business strategy. Organizational Dynamics, 10, 30-48.

Scott, W. R. (1987). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Simon, H. (1960). The new science of management decisions. New York: Harper & Row.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 339-358.

Smyth, J. (Ed.). (1989). Critical perspectives on educational leadership. London: Falmer Press.

Steinbruner, J. D. (1974). The cybernetic theory of decision making. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Swinth, R. L. (1974). Organizational systems for management: Designing, planning and implementation. Columbus, OH: Grid.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper & Row.

Tetrault, M. K. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An experience-derived evaluation model. Journal of Higher Education, 56(4), 363-384.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 59(1), 2-21.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Curricular landscapes, democratic vistas: Transformative leadership in higher education. Greenwich, CT: Praeger.

Tierney, W. G. (1991). Official encouragement, institutional discouragement; Minorities in academe -- The Native American experience. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tierney, W. G., & Foster, W. (1989). Educational leadership and the struggle for mind. The Peabody Journal, 66(3), 1-4.

Wallace, W. L. (1966). Student culture. Chicago: Aldine.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organizations (A. H. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Weis, L. (1985). Between two worlds. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Whetten, D. A. (1984). Effective administrators: Good management on the college campus. Change, 16, 38-43.

Wiener, N. (1961). Cybernetics. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Willis, P. E. (1977). Learning to labor. Aldershot: Gower.